67,108-210 Kogiantis 14-4-7-5

signal transmitted in the Seo reference. Without any benefit, the combination cannot be made and there is no prima facie case of obviousness.

If the Examiner is proposing to substitute the directional signal of *Chizik* for the C/I measurement in *Seo*, that cannot be done because it would eliminate a necessary feature of the *Seo* reference. Any proposed combination that eliminates a necessary feature of the base reference cannot be made.

Even if the combination of Seo and Chizik could be made, the result is not what the Examiner contends. The directional signal of the Chizik reference is not the same as the long term information of Applicant's claims. Just because the words "column vector" appear at col. 8, line 12 of the Chizik reference does not somehow transform the directional signal discussed in that section of the Chizik reference into the long term information of Applicant's invention. Therefore, there is no prima facie case of obviousness because even if the combination could be made, the result is nothing more than Seo's C/I measurement and Chizik's directional signal, neither of which is the same as Applicant's long term information.

Additionally, Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's interpretation of the C/I measurement as long term information. Paragraph 0090 of Seo indicates the opposite because it says, "If a period of the TRFC report or C/I measurement report is long, there is a high probability that a channel condition will be changed in the period." Long term information is not likely to change and, therefore, it is not a reasonable interpretation of Seo to suggest that the C/I or TRFC reports are long term information. This is another reason why the proposed combination of the Seo and Chizik references does not establish a prima facie case of obviousness.

67,108-210 Kogiantis 14-4-7-5

Applicant also respectfully submits that the proposed combination of the Seo and Walton references cannot be made. There is no motivation for making the combination. It is not proper to use Applicant's disclosure as a roadmap and hindsight reasoning to find some justification for adding Walton's MIMO antenna arrangement to Seo's C/I transmission scheme. There is no benefit to doing so because it does not in any way enhance the scheduling of transmitting the C/I report of Seo. Therefore, there is no prima facie case of obviousness.

Moreover, even if the combination could be made, the result is not what the Examiner contends. Claims 7 and 10-13 include the long term information that the Examiner admits is missing from Seo. Therefore, even if Seo and Walton could be combined, the result does not establish a prima facie case against any of claims 7 or 10-13.

Additionally, Walton does not have any teaching regarding using long term information to indicate which of a finite set of codes to use to decode short term information as the Examiner suggests on pages 5 and 6 of the Office Action when rejecting claims 9 and 15. Even if the combination of Seo and Walton could be made, nothing in that combination teaches or suggests using long term information to indicate which of a finite set of codes to use to decode short term information and there is no prima facie case of obviousness.

67,108-210 Kogiantis 14-4-7-5

None of Applicant's claims are obvious because there is no *prima facie* case of obviousness against any of the claims. Applicant respectfully submits that this case is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS

Rv∙

David J. Gaskey Registration No. 37, 139 400 W. Maple Rd., Ste. 350

Birmingham, MI 48009

(248) 988-8360

Dated: January 3, 2007

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE

I hereby certify that this Response, relative to Application Serial No. 18/603,290, is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office (Fax No. (571) 273-8300) on January 3, 2007

Theresa M. Palmateer

N:\Clients\LUCENT TECHNOLOGIES\IP00210\PATENT\Response 1-07.doc